

Theoretical corrections on scalar gravitational waves

Christian Corda

April 17, 2009

Associazione Galileo Galilei, Via Pier Cironi 16 - 59100 PRATO, Italy

Abstract

Following some ideas in the Landau's book, some corrections about errors in the old literature on scalar gravitational waves are given and discussed. Even if such errors can be considered not important from the point of view of observations, because they do not alter the interferometric response function for scalar gravitational waves, the presented analysis is due and very important for a sake of completeness and for a better understanding of the linearized theory of Scalar-Tensor Gravity.

Recently, the data analysis of interferometric gravitational waves (GWs) detectors has been started (for the current status of GWs interferometers see [1]) and the scientific community aims in a first direct detection of GWs in next years.

Detectors for GWs will be important for a better knowledge of the Universe and either to confirm or rule out the physical consistency of General Relativity or of any other theory of gravitation (see [2] for a review). In fact, in the context of Extended Theories of Gravity, some differences between General Relativity and the others theories can be pointed out starting by the linearized theory of gravity. In this picture, detectors for GWs are in principle sensitive also to a hypothetical *scalar* component of gravitational radiation that appears in scalar-tensor gravity [3].

With the aid of some ideas in the Landau's book, in this letter we show some corrections about errors in the old literature on scalar GWs (SGWs). Fortunately, it will result that we can neglect such errors from the point of view of observations, because they only change a sign in the interferometric response function for SGWs. However, we think that the presented analysis is due and quite important for a sake of completeness and for a better understanding of the linearized theory of Scalar-Tensor Gravity.

Let us start from the work [4], which was improved from the work [5]. In [4], the authors did not realize that in their gauge the beam splitter is not left at the origin by the passage of the SGW, and furthermore computed a coordinate-time interval than a proper-time interval, reaching the incorrect conclusion that

the SGW has longitudinal effect, and does not have transverse one. In [5], the transverse effect of SGWs was shown in the so called “Shibata, Nakao and Nakamura” (SNN) gauge of [4].

After this, in [6], the analysis of [5] was generalized with the computation of the frequency-dependent angular pattern of interferometers in the SNN gauge, while in [5] the angular pattern was only computed in the low frequencies approximation (wavelength much larger than the linear dimensions of the interferometer, under this assumption the amplitude of the SGW, Φ , can be considered “frozen” at a value Φ_0).

A further analysis of the SNN gauge has been performed in [7]. The results of [6] are in agreement with the ones in [7].

Now, for a sake of completeness and clarity in the theory, in the following of this letter we show that a subtle error in the geodesic equations of motion in [4] was also present. Such error conditioned the works [5] and [6] too, because in such papers equations arising from [4] have been used, even if the error was not important from the point of view of observations, because it did not alter the interferometric response function.

Following some ideas in the Landau’s book [8], we show that the total differential of the metric tensor is equal to zero, i.e. the metric tensor works like a constant in the total differential, i.e. in the total derivative. This is affirmation is correct in the linearized theory concerning SGWs.

In fact, let us review the demonstration in Chapter 10, Paragraph 86 of [8], which implies that the covariant derivative of the metric tensor is equal to zero, i.e. the covariant derivative works like a constant in the total differential.

Calling DA_i the covariant derivative of an arbitrary vector A_i , it is [8]

$$DA_i = g_{ik}DA^k, \quad (1)$$

but it is also

$$DA_i = D(g_{ik}A^k) = (Dg_{ik})A^k + g_{ik}DA^k, \quad (2)$$

thus it has to be

$$Dg_{ik} = 0. \quad (3)$$

In general, such a demonstration cannot be applied to the total differential. This is because the total differential of a vector is not, in general, a vector, as it is shown in Chapter 10, Paragraph 85 of [8]. However, in the same Chapter 10, Paragraph 85 of [8], an exception is emphasized: the differential becomes a vector when the coordinate transformations are linear functions of the coordinates. But this is exactly the case of the linearized gauge transformations in the linearized theory, i.e. the case of GWs. In fact, the linearization processes concerning theories of gravity are performed in a local Lorentz frame, see Chapter 13, Paragraph 107 of [8] for standard GWs in General Relativity and refs. [3, 4, 5, 6, 7] for SGWs in Scalar Tensor Gravity. We also recall that, in a local Lorentz frame, one can choose an arbitrary coordinate system where the

Christoffel connections vanish, see the discussion between eq. (85,17) and eq. (85,18) in Chapter 10, Paragraph 85 of [8]. This implies that in the linearized theory the raising and lowering of index is performed using the unperturbed Lorentzian metric, see Chapter 12, Paragraph 105 of [8], and the covariant derivatives become the ordinary derivatives, see Chapter 12, Paragraph 105 of [8], note 1.

Thus, if one remains in the linearized theory, the operator D can be substituted in eqs. (4), (5) and (6) with the ordinary differential d , i.e.

$$dA_i = g_{ik}dA^k, \quad (4)$$

$$dA_i = d(g_{ik}A^k) = (dg_{ik})A^k + g_{ik}dA^k, \quad (5)$$

$$dg_{ik} = 0. \quad (6)$$

Now, it will be considered a gauge which was proposed in the first time in [4]. In this gauge a purely plane scalar gravitational wave is travelling in the z + direction (progressive wave $\Phi \equiv \Phi(t - z)$) and acting on an interferometer whose arms are aligned along the x and z axes [4, 5, 7]). In this gauge it is [4, 5, 7]

$$e_{\mu\nu}^{(s)} = \eta_{\mu\nu}, \quad (7)$$

thus the line element results the conformally flat one (we work with $c = 1$ and $\hbar = 1$ in this paper)

$$ds^2 = [1 + \Phi(t - z)](-dt^2 + dz^2 + dx^2 + dy^2). \quad (8)$$

Eq. (7) can be rewritten as

$$\left(\frac{dt}{d\tau}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{dx}{d\tau}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{dy}{d\tau}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{dz}{d\tau}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{(1 + \Phi)}, \quad (9)$$

where τ is the proper time of the test masses.

From eqs. (8) and (9) the authors of [4] obtained the geodesic equations of motion for test masses (i.e. the beam-splitter and the mirrors of the interferometer), see eq. 3.21, 3.22 and 3.23 in [4],

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\tau}[(1 + \Phi)\frac{dx}{d\tau}] &= 0 \\ \frac{d}{d\tau}[(1 + \Phi)\frac{dy}{d\tau}] &= 0 \\ \frac{d}{d\tau}[(1 + \Phi)\frac{dt}{d\tau}] &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial_t(1 + \Phi)}{(1 + \Phi)} \\ \frac{d}{d\tau}[(1 + \Phi)\frac{dz}{d\tau}] &= -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial_z(1 + \Phi)}{(1 + \Phi)}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

which are not correct in our opinion.

Other geodesic equations of motion which are not correct have been used, in our opinion, in [6], see eqs. 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5, in this case for a wave travelling in the z - direction (regressive wave). However, such a error is not important from the point of view of observations, because it does not alter the interferometric response function for SGWs. In fact, eq. (5.25) in [6] is equal to eq. 150 in [7], which has been computed in another gauge. This is because the error in the in eqs. (10) generates only a variation in the sign of the response function of the single arm, and such an error is compensated when, computing the total response function, one takes the absolute value of the difference between the response functions of the two arms.

On the other hand, our analysis is very important for a sake of completeness and for a better understanding of the linearized theory of Scalar-Tensor Gravity.

To derive the correct geodesic equation of motion for a progressive wave, eq. (87,3) of ref. [8], which is

$$\frac{d^2 x^i}{d\tau^2} + \Gamma_{kl}^i \frac{dx^k}{d\tau} \frac{dx^l}{d\tau} = 0, \quad (11)$$

can be used.

In this way, using equation (9), it results

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2 x}{d\tau^2} &= 0 \\ \frac{d^2 y}{d\tau^2} &= 0 \\ \frac{d^2 t}{d\tau^2} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial_t(1+\Phi)}{(1+\Phi)^2} \\ \frac{d^2 z}{d\tau^2} &= -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial_z(1+\Phi)}{(1+\Phi)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Now, let us see the difference between the correct eqs. (12) and the wrong ones (10) from a mathematical point of view. Let us rewrite eqs. (10) as

$$\begin{aligned} d[(1+\Phi) \frac{dx}{d\tau}] &= 0 \\ d[(1+\Phi) \frac{dy}{d\tau}] &= 0 \\ d[(1+\Phi) \frac{dt}{d\tau}] &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial_t(1+\Phi)}{(1+\Phi)} d\tau \\ d[(1+\Phi) \frac{dz}{d\tau}] &= -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial_z(1+\Phi)}{(1+\Phi)} d\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

If one considers eq. (6) eqs. (13) have to be correctly rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
d[(1 + \Phi) \frac{dx}{d\tau}] &= (1 + \Phi) d[\frac{dx}{d\tau}] = 0 \\
d[(1 + \Phi) \frac{dy}{d\tau}] &= (1 + \Phi) d[\frac{dy}{d\tau}] = 0 \\
d[(1 + \Phi) \frac{dt}{d\tau}] &= (1 + \Phi) d[\frac{dt}{d\tau}] = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial_t(1+\Phi)}{(1+\Phi)} d\tau \\
d[(1 + \Phi) \frac{dz}{d\tau}] &= (1 + \Phi) d[\frac{dz}{d\tau}] = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial_z(1+\Phi)}{(1+\Phi)} d\tau,
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

that becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d^2 x}{d\tau^2} &= 0 \\
\frac{d^2 y}{d\tau^2} &= 0 \\
\frac{d^2 t}{d\tau^2} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial_t(1+\Phi)}{(1+\Phi)^2} \\
\frac{d^2 z}{d\tau^2} &= -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial_z(1+\Phi)}{(1+\Phi)^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

which are exactly eqs. (12).

The fact that the metric tensor works like a constant in the ordinary differential has to be emphasized if one uses eq. (87,3a) of ref. [8], which is

$$\frac{du_i}{d\tau} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial g_{kl}}{\partial x^i} u^k u^l = 0, \tag{16}$$

in the derivation of the geodesic equations of motion. In fact, in this case, if one does not recall that the metric tensor works like a constant in the ordinary differential, the wrong eqs. (10) are directly obtained from eq. (16).

In [4] the authors did not realize that the metric tensor works like a constant in the ordinary differential when one works in the linearized theory, obtaining the wrong equations (10).

Resuming, in this letter, some ideas in the Landau's book have been used to perform some corrections about errors in the old literature on SGWs.

Even if such errors can be considered not important from the point of view of observations, because they do not alter the interferometric response function for scalar gravitational waves, the presented analysis is due and very important for a sake of completeness and for a better understanding of the linearized theory of Scalar-Tensor Gravity.

References

- [1] A. Giazotto - Journ. of Phys., Conf. Series 120, 032002 (2008)
- [2] C. Corda - arXiv:0902.2356 - To appear in Proceedings of the 3rd Stueckelberg Workshop, July 2008, Pescara, Italy(2009)

- [3] T. Damour and G. Esposito-Farese - Class. Quant. Grav. **9** 2093-2176 (1992)
- [4] Shibata M, Nakao K and Nakamura T - Phys. Rev. D **50**, 7304 (1994)
- [5] Maggiore M and Nicolis A - Phys. Rev. D **62** 024004 (2000); also in gr-qc/9907055
- [6] Nakao K, Harada T, Shibata M, Kawamura S and Nakamura T - Phys. Rev. D **63**, 082001 (2001)
- [7] S. Capozziello and C. Corda - Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **15** 1119 -1150 (2006)
- [8] Landau L and Lifshits E - “Teoria dei campi” - Editori riuniti edition III (1999)